

REMARKS

Claims 16-25 are now pending in the application. Claims 16 and 17 are allowed. Claims 18, 19, 21-23 and 25 stand rejected. Claims 20 and 24 are objected to. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Examiner states that claims 16 and 17 are allowable over the prior art of record. The Examiner also states that claims 20 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holzer, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,565 hereinafter Holzer). Claims 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ortmann (U.S. Pat. No. 5,324,052 hereinafter Ortmann). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claim 18 has been amended to include "said shank portion includes an angularly disposed edge section which is in a plane angularly offset by an acute angle from said cutting edge of said cutting portion." Applicants submit this feature can be found in the specification and drawings as filed and is thus not new matter. Applicants assert this feature is neither taught nor suggested by Holzer or Ortmann. Holzer appears to disclose only a face 40b which is at least perpendicular if not obtuse to the cutting surface (Figure 6). Similarly, Ortmann appears to disclose a face which is perpendicular to the cutting surface (Figure 3).

Accordingly, as neither Holzer nor Ortmann teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 18 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, as claim 19 depends from claim 18, claim 19 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

With regard to independent claim 22, Applicant notes claim 22 has been amended to include the limitation of the "saw blade is insertable between said pair of lateral walls until said angularly disposed edge section contacts one of said pair of lateral walls." First, Applicants respectfully submit this amendment does not introduce new matter as this feature can be found in the specification and drawings as filed. Next, Applicants assert this feature as claimed is not taught or suggested by Ortmann.

Ortmann appears to disclose merely a perpendicular section which contacts a rib 13 formed in the base 3 (Figure 3) and not contacting "one of said pair of lateral walls" as claimed. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert independent claim 22 is patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable by or, in the alternative, under U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Holzer. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated previously, Applicants have amended independent claim 22 to include the limitation of the "saw blade is insertable between said pair of lateral walls until said angularly disposed edge section contacts one of said pair of lateral walls." Applicants assert this feature is not taught or suggested by Holzer. Specifically, Holzer teaches

using a pin 52 which contacts the perpendicular or obtuse section 40b (Column 4, lines 26-28). Thus, as Holzer fails to teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed, Applicants assert independent claim 22 is patentable and in condition for allowance. In addition, Applicants note claim 25 depends from independent claim 22 and is also considered patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holzer in view of Tseng (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,792 hereinafter Tseng). Claims 19 and 23 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortmann in view of Tseng. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants note claims 19 and 23 depend from either independent claim 18 or 22. As stated previously, Applicants believe claims 18 and 22 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 19 and 23 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-24-04

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/EKS/ps